



Patent
Attorney's Docket No. 040080-164

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	
Petter KARLSSON et al.)	Group Art Unit: 3724
Application No.: 09/986,544)	Examiner: J. Windmuller
Filed: November 9, 2001)	Confirmation No.: 5848
For: ARRANGEMENT FOR CUTTING)	
AN OPTICAL FIBRE)	

#8
K. J.
K. J.
C. J.
1/22/04

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED
DEC 18 2003

Sir:

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

In response to the Office Action mailed September 29, 2003, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 in view of the remarks presented below.

In paragraph 2, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,382,276 to Hakoun et al. ("Hakoun") in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,880,028 to Frederick, Jr. ("Fredrick"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Hakoun discloses an apparatus and method for cutting an optical fiber ribbon on an oblique angle. The apparatus includes, among other things, two jaws, an anvil, and a blade attached to a cutter. According to Hakoun, once the jaws are closed, the anvil is moved along an axis Y toward the cutter to place the fiber under tension. The blade of the cutter is then displaced along the Y axis toward the anvil, cutting the fibers. (See col. 4, lines 45-52, and col. 4, lines 10-16).

Frederick discloses a method and apparatus for monitoring and controlling glass cutting. More specifically, Frederick discloses an apparatus and method for manually or automatically adjusting the pressure on a scoring tool based on the sound waves emitted when the scoring tool scores a plate of glass. Furthermore, Frederick discloses that the sound waves can be detected by a microphone or ultrasonic sensor.

It is well known that one of the criteria required to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is that there must be some motivation to combine the references. In the present case, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to modify the device of Hakoun with a microphone detector to detect the completion of the cut and to effect the stop of the cutting movement as taught by Frederick for better automated cutting. This assertion is improper for the following reasons.

First, the Office Action fails to provide any evidence that the device for cutting a *ribbon of optical fibers* can be modified to include the means, disclosed by Frederick, for detecting sound waves emitted by the *scoring of glass plates*. Second, nowhere in Frederick is there any disclosure of stopping the cutting movement based on the microphone detector as alleged by the Office Action. To the contrary, Frederick discloses that the signal output from the detector is used to adjust the pressure on the scoring tool during the scoring operation to ensure a uniform cut (see column 1, lines 60-67 of Frederick). Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify the ribbon cutting device of Hakoun in view of the disclosure of Frederick.

Another of the criteria that must be met to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, is that the combination must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, the

combination of Hakoun and Frederick fails to render claims 1, 3 and 4 unpatentable for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Hakoun, as discussed above, discloses a method and apparatus for cutting a ribbon of optical fibers obliquely. However, Hakoun fails to disclose or suggest a control unit for starting a fiber cutter motor when a fiber is located in the fiber cutter and for stopping the motor when a snap off of the fiber is detected as recited in claim.

Although Frederick discloses a microphone for detecting the sound waves emitted by the scoring of a plate of glass, Frederick fails to disclose that the control unit starts the motor when a fiber is located in the fiber cutter and stops the motor when the detector detects a snap off of the fiber, as claimed.

Since Hakoun and Frederick both fail to disclose or suggest a control unit as claimed, the combination of these two patents cannot possibly disclose or suggest said elements. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Hakoun and Frederick the combination would still fail to render claim 1 unpatentable.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Hakoun and Frederick for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In paragraph 3, the Office Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Hakoun and Frederick, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,832,801 to Bando ("Bando"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable distinguishable over the combination of Hakoun and Frederick for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Bando discloses a numerical controller cutter apparatus for cutting a glass plate. However, Bando fails to overcome the deficiencies of Hakoun Frederick.

Since Hakoun, Frederick and Bando each fail to disclose or suggest a control unit as claimed, the combination of these two patents cannot possibly disclose or suggest said elements. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Hakoun, Frederick and Bando, as suggested by the Office Action, the combination would still fail to render claim 2 unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

This application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this application, he invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below in order to expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Penny L. Caudle
Penny L. Caudle
Registration No. 46,607

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: December 16, 2003